

20060415.ba v03_n912.bam.20060415

>From ???@??? Sat Apr 15 17:09:24 2006 -0500
Date: Sat, 15 Apr 2006 22:08:14 GMT
From: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: BOATANCHORS digest 3912
Message-Id: <20060415220815.958021B830B@srvr1.theporch.com>

BOATANCHORS Digest 3912

Topics covered in this issue include:

- 1) Re: VIKing 1
by johnmb <johnmb@nc.rr.com>
- 2) Hank speaketh not falsely!
by Rhett George <rtg@ee.duke.edu>
- 3) Re: Post WWII exhibit? BC-348
by scb@hiwaay.net
- 4) Re: VIKing 1 - thanks for your replies
by "Al Parker" <anchor@ec.rr.com>
- 5) RE: VIKing 1 - thanks for your replies
by "Rodger" <WQ9E@dtinspeed.net>
- 6) Re: Post WWII exhibit? BC-348
by W7QH0@aol.com
- 7) Re: Post WWII exhibit? BC-348
by WA5CAB@cs.com
- 8) Canadian Forces Station Masset
by Jerry Proc <jerry7proc@yahoo.com>
- 9) Re: Post WWII exhibit? BC-348
by Tom Norris <r390a@bellsouth.net>
- 10) BC-348 cost
by Scott Robinson <spr@earthlink.net>
- 11) Hallicrafters SX-100 Inquiry
by Mike Steussy <ae4r@erols.com>
- 12) Re: BC-348 cost
by WA5CAB@cs.com
- 13) Re: VIKing 1 - thanks for your replies
by "Arden Allen" <gumbear@pacbell.net>
- 14) The Cost of Things
by Jerry Proc <jerry7proc@yahoo.com>
- 15) Re: ADMINISTRIVIA: NO Fancy HTML in Posts
by Jan Skirrow <jan@skirrow.org>
- 16) And another dirty old Viking
by Richard Post <postr@ohiou.edu>

Message-ID: <16196709.1145048879906.JavaMail.Administrator@atp>

Date: Fri, 14 Apr 2006 14:07:59 -0700 (PDT)
From: johnmb <johnmb@nc.rr.com>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: Viking 1
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Howdy Neighbor,

One of my early BA projects was a Viking I and I still like the rig. I don't recall the thing being any more TVI prone than any other rig of the era. Mine was in the standard cabinet (which I believe is aluminum?!) and you're right Al, not much (any) filtering or shielding.

In any event, it's particularly easy to work on, and mine sounded pretty good ... they clean up very nicely (aluminum chassis and typically nice EFJ hardware and sockets. I'd surely give it a go, Al.

John (all-too-temporarily on Ocracoke)

On Fri, 14 Apr 2006 16:17:05 -0400 Al Parker <anchor@ec.rr.com> wrote.

>Hi folks,

> A dirty Johnson Viking 1 came home with me yesterday. I guess my

>basic question is, "is it worthy of refurbishment?"

> I had a Viking II back in the late 50's when 10m was open all day
>long, I worked Europeans in the AM & Australia/New Zealand in the evening,
>on AM or CW. When I heard of this V-1, I thought/hoped it was a Viking
>II, but was not to be rewarded. Johnson put out a TVI kit for the Viking
>1, and this one did not receive it. I know the Viking II's were built
>like Fort Knox in re: to signals getting out only where wanted.

> This one is pretty dirty, but appears to be all there and in fair
>condition. It appears to have been factory wired, the soldering is well
>done. It has an 829B as final, which from what I see was a factory
>authorized alternate to the 4D32. It has no cabinet, but I suspect the
>cabinet was largely cosmetic and didn't do much for TVI unless the kit was
>installed. It had been installed in a rack-type mounting with a receiver,
>but has been out in the open in a closed garage for 10 yrs or so now.

> If I had a cabinet I'd be much more inclined to get to work on it. If
>anyone can give me a lead on one I'd appreciate it. Barring that, I'm
>just interested in general opinions on present use of the Viking One. I
>can't remember hearing any on the air, or of anyone working on one, in
>recent years. I had entertained the thought of putting it on 160m. I'm
>not terribly worried about TVI, particularly if I get on 160 with such
>relatively low power.

>TIA, 73,

>Al, W8UT

>New Bern, NC
>BoatAnchors appreciated here
><http://www.boatanchors.org>
><http://www.hammarlund.info>

Date: Fri, 14 Apr 2006 17:14:27 -0400
From: Rhett George <rtg@ee.duke.edu>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Hank speaketh not falsely!
Message-ID: <20060414211427.GC6556@ee.duke.edu>
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Disposition: inline

- Greetings -

Regarding HTML, Hank speaketh not falsely. He wrote, "HTML for text posts is just a huge bandwidth/storage hog."

Folks lovingly attend to transmitters and regen receivers to keep them from being bandwidth hogs on the aether (and to avoid unfriendly letters from the FCC). Why do some of these same folks get on the internet and maximize their use of bandwidth by sending the message in several modes (including HTML)? Could it be a feeling of power? The answer eludes me.

73
Rhett - KE4HIH

From: scb@hiwaay.net
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Date: Fri, 14 Apr 2006 18:09:46 -0500
MIME-Version: 1.0
Subject: Re: Post WWII exhibit? BC-348
CC: boatanchors@theporch.com
Message-ID: <443FE56A.2956.2440918@localhost>
Content-type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-transfer-encoding: 7BIT
Content-description: Mail message body

> Drooled over my brother's BC348 (he was older, had a
> job, and could afford it).

What did milsurp BC-348s sell for then & later? What was the last of them sold for from the surplus outlets? I remember seeing them in ads in the mid-50s but not the prices, not knowing exactly what they were or having the money then.

I'd heard that Fair & others may have offered NIB BC-348-Q not so long ago

for how much?

Thnx!

Steve bringhurst

Message-ID: <01fe01c6602b\$b888c870\$3201a8c0@w8ut>

From: "Al Parker" <anchor@ec.rr.com>

To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>

Subject: Re: VIKing 1 - thanks for your replies

Date: Fri, 14 Apr 2006 21:27:09 -0400

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Hi folks, again,

Thanks for all the responses. The first 2 were from neighboring friends who I see at most 'fests in the area, Nick & John, who replied to the list. I expected to hear from Nick, as he's a Johnson "nut" who sold me his Invader 2000 a few yrs ago, and John keeps in touch on such topics. (John, hope you & Lisa are having a great time out there, nice wx for it, and a full moon. CU & Nick next Sun. at Raleigh'fest.) 6 others replied, 5 were privately to me, and I've pasted their thoughts in below, for all to see (no permission asked). As I expected from this august group, everyone encouraged me to proceed with refurbishment.

But, as I, like most of us, am a glutton for punishment, I'll ask your further opinions, closely related. A few months ago I got a homebrewed version of the DX-100, done by a fellow who I knew some years ago when we were in the same NC club. He was fully qualified to do the job, as he was an engineer for Sylvania, & involved with their 6146 design & production at the time he built it. It hasn't been in operation for some years, I'd suspect probably more than 20 or even 30+, and is missing some parts, incl. the internal VF0. You can see it at:

http://www.boatanchors.org/w3ohv_cholly.htm

Which one of these projects would you get into first? I have plenty of others to work on also, and am presently well into an AR-88 (neat rcvr), and have 2 other rcvrs that must be done in the next few mo.s. Please make any replies to all the list. The AR-88 can be seen at:

<http://www.boatanchors.org/AR88.htm>

Many thanks again,

73,

Al, W8UT

New Bern, NC

BoatAnchors appreciated here

<http://www.boatanchors.org>

<http://www.hammarlund.info>

prior comments that haven't been seen by the list:

1. have a Viking 1 and like it very much, it is paired with my SX-28A. Like yours, mine came without a cabinet and I later found one on the list.

It has nice audio and of course works well with the external VFO-122.

The two problems I experienced with mine were:

Arcing with one of the 5R4 rectifier sockets. There was a dust/carbon path on one of the sockets that was arcing to ground. I cleaned up the socket and replaced the offending tube, that was 6 years ago and the problem has not reappeared.

The "almost major" problem was that I nearly fried the low voltage transformer and 6.3 volt wiring due to a shorted pilot lamp. An indicator lamp was out and I replaced it with a new one, turning on the power resulted in no light and instant smoke. I assumed something had gone wrong with the socket but the replacement lamp (probably proudly made in Red China) had a direct short in the base. I did add a fuse to the filament line just to avoid any future repeats of that rather odd behavior.

I really like the looks of the V1 (particularly with the proper cabinet), I think it is very much worth saving. I am in a very rural area and use DirectTV so I have had no TVI problems with mine.

2. Fix it for sure. I hear them on from time to time. They did run a 4D32. but 829 acceptable I guess. I have a Viking II and it was a mess. Works well now.

3. Mine has the TVI kit so I can't comment on how one would work without it. I think the cabinets are very hard to find. In my opinion, the Viking 1 is one of the better transmitters they built based on design and ruggedness. It certainly is better designed than a Viking II (sounds way better) or a Valiant (sounds better, less maintenance). I would definitely restore it. If you have TVI (unlikely in this cable/satellite tv age), replicating the 'kit' would not be difficult, cabinet or no cabinet. I think you don't hear as many Viking 1's on the air as you do 2's merely because they didn't sell nearly as many.

4. I have a Viking 1 complete with the factory mod cages and stuff to TVI it. I really like mine and have included a couple of pix. Opps can't find the Viking I pix but I will send them later.

5. I rebuilt one about 10 years ago. This one had the 4D32 in it, but the 829-B was so cheap after WW-II that it was hard to pass them up! I think Collins was buying up all the 4D32s!! :-)

The "original" cabinet wasn't anything special, except it was painted a VERY dark maroon. Every one I saw for years was black, but apparently they had all been repainted. When I finally saw a maroon one, I thought it was black at first!!

It's a good little transmitter, NO shielding, other than the cabinet

with painted mating surfaces..... But it was no dirtier than any other Class C transmitter, and if the chassis was grounded worked fine until 21 Mc TV IF's became popular!! I wouldn't expect any trouble today, other than these crappy excuses for telephones they are selling now.

----- Original Message -----

From: "Al Parker" <anchor@ec.rr.com>
To: "Old Tube Radios" <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Sent: Friday, April 14, 2006 4:17 PM
Subject: VIking 1

> Hi folks,
> A dirty Johnson Viking 1 came home with me yesterday. I guess my
> basic question is, "is it worthy of refurbishment?"

From: "Rodger" <WQ9E@dtnspeed.net>
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: RE: VIking 1 - thanks for your replies
Date: Fri, 14 Apr 2006 21:07:13 -0500
Message-ID: <000001c66031\$506a8520\$8001640a@D1JXNQ31>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="us-ascii"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

Hi Al (and list),

My vote would be to start with the Viking I as it probably will not take much to put it back in perfect operating condition. It is a pretty straightforward rig and well built. Once it is back in shape = mechanically and electronically you can move on to the probably more complex DX-100 = clone while waiting for a Viking 1 cabinet to materialize. I think I got my V = 1 cabinet from someone on this list.

I DO NOT advise doing what I am currently doing, having too many rigs = under restoration at once:

Main project: Gates BC-250GY-it is in pretty good shape but had some modifications for remote control along with an extra hole put in the = front

panel. Currently it is in the new 750 sq. foot basement hamshack =
undergoing
cosmetic restoration, some wiring replacement (questionable HV wiring) =
soon
to follow. Hopefully in early summer it will be on 160 driven by one of =
my
Signal Shifters.

Complex project: Restoration of a much modified HRO-50T1. Fortunately =
it
has no extra holes and all of the major components are still in place.
However, it had a solid state voltage regulator added; 30 watt output
transformer covering the sockets for the calibrator and nbfm adaptor =
along
with individual bias pots for the 6V6 output tubes; and some sort of SS
noise limiter and product detector. Currently I am putting it back to =
stock
using the schematic and color photographs of the wire dress of a
non-modified HRO-50T1 (thanks to K9TR for the photos!).

Annoying project: repair of the synthesizer section of a Sony =
ICF-6800W, I
have been through the synthesizer sections of an Icom DV-21, KLM =
Multi-2700,
and Yaesu FRG-7700. Each time I say never again-no more synthesizers,
however see the "Pain yet-to-come" section to see how well I keep those
vows.

Related project: Completing the trim carpentry for the master bedroom =
suite
built above the new hamshack, tables and shelves for the equipment, and
finish wiring for the hamshack. When completed, most of the boatanchors
will move to their larger quarters but the Desk KW is not going down a
flight of stairs!

Pain yet-to-come: An HRO-500 is on the way, I am fairly confident it =
will
require some TLC.

Maintenance project: I really need to go through the calibration =
procedure
for my most often used Tek 7000 series scopes and plug-ins. I think =
this
whole boat anchor addiction started when I was 9 or 10 and my father =
taught
me how to go through the calibration procedure on the Tektronix 500 =
series
scopes. I still have a 514AD that belonged to my father that I need to =

get
back into operating condition.

Good luck with your projects and see you at the asylum for the =
terminally
rosin core fume addicted, Rodger WQ9E

> -----Original Message-----
> From: owner-boatanchors@theporch.com [mailto:owner-
> boatanchors@theporch.com] On Behalf Of Al Parker
> Sent: Friday, April 14, 2006 8:27 PM
> To: Old Tube Radios
> Subject: Re: VIKing 1 - thanks for your replies
>=20
> Hi folks, again,
> Thanks for all the responses. The first 2 were from neighboring
> friends who I see at most 'fests in the area, Nick & John, who replied =
> to
> the list. I expected to hear from Nick, as he's a Johnson "nut" who =
> sold
> me his Invader 2000 a few yrs ago, and John keeps in touch on such =
> topics.
> (John, hope you & Lisa are having a great time out there, nice wx for =
> it,
> and a full moon. CU & Nick next Sun. at Raleigh'fest.) 6 others
> replied, 5 were privately to me, and I've pasted their thoughts in =
> below,
> for all to see (no permission asked). As I expected from this august
> group, everyone encouraged me to proceed with refurbishment.
> But, as I, like most of us, am a glutton for punishment, I'll ask =
> your
> further opinions, closely related. A few months ago I got a =
> homebrewed
> version of the DX-100, done by a fellow who I knew some years ago when =
> we
> were in the same NC club. He was fully qualified to do the job, as he =
> was
> an engineer for Sylvania, & involved with their 6146 design & =
> production
> at the time he built it. It hasn't been in operation for some years, =
> I'd
> suspect probably more than 20 or even 30+, and is missing some parts,
> incl. the internal VFO. You can see it at:
> http://www.boatanchors.org/w3ohv_cholly.htm
> Which one of these projects would you get into first? I have =
> plenty
> of others to work on also, and am presently well into an AR-88 (neat

> rcvr), and have 2 other rcvrs that must be done in the next few mo.s.
> Please make any replies to all the list. The AR-88 can be seen at:
> <http://www.boatanchors.org/AR88.htm>
> Many thanks again,
> 73,
> Al, W8UT
> New Bern, NC
> BoatAnchors appreciated here
> <http://www.boatanchors.org>
> <http://www.hammarlund.info>
>=20
>=20

From: W7QHO@aol.com
Message-ID: <3c9.bf732.3171b938@aol.com>
Date: Fri, 14 Apr 2006 22:49:28 EDT
Subject: Re: Post WWII exhibit? BC-348
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="part1_3c9.bf732.3171b938_boundary"

--part1_3c9.bf732.3171b938_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

In a message dated 4/14/06 4:10:32 PM, scb@hiwaay.net writes:

> What did milsurp BC-348s sell for then & later
>

Fair Radio was advertising BC-348P models for \$49.50 in 1947 (advert. in Dec. 47 Radio News).

Dennis D. W7QHO
Glendale, CA

--part1_3c9.bf732.3171b938_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

* * * * *
* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- *
* This post contains a forbidden message format *
* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) *

* Mail Lists at theporch.com only accept PLAIN TEXT *
* If your postings display this message your mail program *
* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting *
* * * * *

--part1_3c9.bf732.3171b938_boundary--

From: WA5CAB@cs.com
Message-ID: <3cc.c7254.3171c010@cs.com>
Date: Fri, 14 Apr 2006 23:18:40 EDT
Subject: Re: Post WWII exhibit? BC-348
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="part1_3cc.c7254.3171c010_boundary"

--part1_3cc.c7254.3171c010_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

That's something on the order of \$900 in 2006 dollars.

In a message dated 4/14/2006 9:50:26 PM Central Daylight Time, W7QH0@aol.com writes:

>
> >What did milsurp BC-348s sell for then &later
> >
>
> Fair Radio was advertising BC-348P models for \$49.50 in 1947 (advert. in
> Dec. 47 Radio News).

Robert & Susan Downs - Houston
<<http://www.wa5cab.com>> (Web Store)
MVPA 9480
<wa5cab@cs.com> (Primary email)
<wa5cab@houston.rr.com> (Backup email)

--part1_3cc.c7254.3171c010_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

* * * * *
* ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED--- *
* This post contains a forbidden message format *
* (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) *
* Mail Lists at theporch.com only accept PLAIN TEXT *
* If your postings display this message your mail program *

* is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting *

--part1_3cc.c7254.3171c010_boundary--

Message-ID: <20060415034724.38858.qmail@web34215.mail.mud.yahoo.com>
Date: Fri, 14 Apr 2006 20:47:24 -0700 (PDT)
From: Jerry Proc <jerry7proc@yahoo.com>
Subject: Canadian Forces Station Masset
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Hello Everyone,

I am pleased to announce the availability of a new web page which documents the history of Canadian Forces Station Masset - part of a continuing web series which traces the history of former and present Canadian Signals Intelligence stations.

<http://www.jproc.ca/rrp/masset.html>

--

Regards,
Jerry Proc
E-mail: jerry7proc@yahoo.com

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

Mime-Version: 1.0 (Apple Message framework v746.2)
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII; delsp=yes; format=flowed
Message-Id: <C376C2BA-CC3F-4497-ABF6-A1CBC258897F@bellsouth.net>
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit
From: Tom Norris <r390a@bellsouth.net>
Subject: Re: Post WWII exhibit? BC-348
Date: Fri, 14 Apr 2006 22:56:43 -0500
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>

Hmm. That's pretty much in R-390 cost territory.

How much would a new/used SP-100/200 and kin cost, if they could have been found reasonable in the late 40's early 50's? 51J3? What about later one, say the early 60's?

Tom NU4G

On Apr 14, 2006, at 10:18 PM, WA5CAB@cs.com wrote:

```
> That's something on the order of $900 in 2006 dollars.
>
> In a message dated 4/14/2006 9:50:26 PM Central Daylight Time,
> W7QH0@aol.com
> writes:
>>
>>> What did milsurp BC-348s sell for then & later
>>>
>>
>> Fair Radio was advertising BC-348P models for $49.50 in 1947
>> (advert. in
>> Dec. 47 Radio News).
>
> Robert & Susan Downs - Houston
> <http://www.wa5cab.com> (Web Store)
> MVPA 9480
> <wa5cab@cs.com> (Primary email)
> <wa5cab@houston.rr.com> (Backup email)
```

```
-----
Mime-Version: 1.0
Message-Id: <p0623090bc0662395bdeb@[192.168.1.2]>
Date: Fri, 14 Apr 2006 21:15:31 -0700
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
From: Scott Robinson <spr@earthlink.net>
Subject: BC-348 cost
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"
```

Folks,

Not so! Using an on-line inflation calculator, I get \$468 and change, still a noticeable sum.

/scott

At 11:18 PM -0400 4/14/06, WA5CAB@cs.com wrote:

```
> That's something on the order of $900 in 2006 dollars.
>
> In a message dated 4/14/2006 9:50:26 PM Central Daylight Time, W7QH0@aol.com
> writes:
```

>>
>> >What did milsurp BC-348s sell for then &later
>> >
>>
>> Fair Radio was advertising BC-348P models for \$49.50 in 1947 (advert. in
>> Dec. 47 Radio News).
>
>Robert & Susan Downs - Houston
><<http://www.wa5cab.com>> (Web Store)
>MVPA 9480
><wa5cab@cs.com> (Primary email)
><wa5cab@houston.rr.com> (Backup email)

Message-ID: <44407DE8.4020103@erols.com>
Date: Sat, 15 Apr 2006 01:00:24 -0400
From: Mike Steussy <ae4r@erols.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Hallicrafters SX-100 Inquiry
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Ahoy! I recently acquired same in excellent condition, though very, very dirty. Now cleaned up, it is looking beautiful and I hope to have it playing soon. This one is stamped Mark 2 on the notch filter box. The crystals are stamped 10/61. This made me wonder since most references, including Dachis, p. 66, show years of manufacture 1956-1961.

Looking in my ARRL Handbooks for 1962 and 1963, I was surprised to find the venerable SX-100, still advertised. Using the crystals as a dating indicator, I'm guessing this one was sold in late 1961 or in 1962. Question for the group: What is the real history of this classic receiver? To enjoy such a long production run this rather expensive radio had to have been a great seller and good performer on the air. Please comment on the list.

I'm guessing the SX-100 was sold until replaced in the product line in 1963-64 by the SX-122, whose specifications and circuit diagram look very similar to those of the SX-100. The '122 uses 6DC6s in the RF and high IF amps, features a product detector, and has miniature tubes in the audio stages (though keeps the 5Y3 rectifier). It does not have the SX-100's expensive gear-driven dials, notch filter or crystal calibrator as standard equipment.

Thanks and 73,
Mike Steussy AE4R

From: WA5CAB@cs.com
Message-ID: <39d.711917.3171d860@cs.com>
Date: Sat, 15 Apr 2006 01:02:24 EDT
Subject: Re: BC-348 cost
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
MIME-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary="part1_39d.711917.3171d860_boundary"

--part1_39d.711917.3171d860_boundary
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="US-ASCII"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

Sorry, but the on-line source, as almost all are, is infected with GIGO. I have original documents with my name on them (stuff I bought or Form W2 for what I was paid) showing that the increase just from 1969 to 1996 was 10X. Don't forget that 99-44/100% of everything ever posted to the Internet is wrong. As a good example, even the "official" U.S. Army Signal Corps history site still says that the 14 (actually it says 12) volt version of the BC-348 was the BC-324. 'taint so, as anyone with greater than single digit IQ knows.

In a message dated 4/14/2006 11:15:17 PM Central Daylight Time, spr@earthlink.net writes:

> Folks,
>
> Not so! Using an on-line inflation calculator, I get \$468 and
> change, still a noticeable sum.
>
> /scott
>
> At 11:18 PM -0400 4/14/06, WA5CAB@cs.com wrote:
> >That's something on the order of \$900 in 2006 dollars.
> >
> >In a message dated 4/14/2006 9:50:26 PM Central Daylight Time,
> >W7QH0@aol.com
> >writes:
> >>
> >> >What did milsurp BC-348s sell for then &later
> >> >
> >>
> >> Fair Radio was advertising BC-348P models for \$49.50 in 1947 (advert.
> in
> >> Dec. 47 Radio News).
> >

Robert Downs - Houston
<<http://www.wa5cab.com>> (Web Store)

MVPA 9480

<wa5cab@cs.com> (Primary email)

<wa5cab@houston.rr.com> (Backup email)

--part1_39d.711917.3171d860_boundary

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

```
* * * * *
*      ---REMAINDER OF MESSAGE TRUNCATED---      *
*      This post contains a forbidden message format      *
*      (such as an attached file, a v-card, HTML formatting) *
*      Mail Lists at theporch.com only accept PLAIN TEXT      *
*      If your postings display this message your mail program *
*      is not set to send PLAIN TEXT ONLY and needs adjusting *
* * * * *
```

--part1_39d.711917.3171d860_boundary--

Message-ID: <004801c66050\$82e231f0\$c9e47443@KB6NAX>

From: "Arden Allen" <gumbear@pacbell.net>

To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>

Subject: Re: VIking 1 - thanks for your replies

Date: Fri, 14 Apr 2006 22:46:26 -0700

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain;
charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

>Good luck with your projects and see you at the asylum for the
terminally
rosin core fume addicted,

And yet to come, ROHS compliant Medicare!good luck :-(

Arden Allen

KB6NAX

Message-ID: <20060415135352.89184.qmail@web34204.mail.mud.yahoo.com>

Date: Sat, 15 Apr 2006 06:53:52 -0700 (PDT)

From: Jerry Proc <jerry7proc@yahoo.com>

Subject: The Cost of Things

To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 8bit

Hello Everyone,

Several months ago I wanted to know what a WWII facility cost in today's dollars.

I found one web site which had a inflation calculator. I chose the "year pairs" of 1943 to 2005 and the rate was 1024%.

Unfortunately I did save the URL of the site but you ought to be able to Google such a resource easily.

Does that help with pricing the BC348?

--

Regards,
Jerry Proc
E-mail: jerry7proc@yahoo.com

Do You Yahoo!?
Tired of spam? Yahoo! Mail has the best spam protection around
<http://mail.yahoo.com>

Message-ID: <44414D5A.9030200@skirrow.org>
Date: Sat, 15 Apr 2006 12:45:30 -0700
From: Jan Skirrow <jan@skirrow.org>
MIME-Version: 1.0
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
CC: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
Subject: Re: ADMINISTRIVIA: NO Fancy HTML in Posts
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=ISO-8859-1; format=flowed
Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

I have moderated a list with about 450 members for the past six years. I allowed HTML. I had only one complaint over that six years from someone who had problems with HTML. We never had a single problem with spam getting thru the excellent filters my ISP uses, and I'm not aware of a single post being rejected because the filters thought it was spam.

I may have miscounted, but I think only one guy so far has said he cannot read posts with HTML in them. I'm sure there are others, but I

seriously question the notion that there are "many, many" such people. But the last half dozen posts on the list that I wanted to read were truncated because of HTML.

Now I could blame the posters for the truncated posts - that's what this Listowner and some members do. But I think that the nuisance value of so many truncated posts has to be considered. Sure, HTML takes more bandwidth - but the truncated posts thing is like having the Voice of America transmitter in the vacant lot next door come on the air just when I'm trying to copy a weak signal nearby. For me the S/N ratio on this list has declined from what it used to be, and not due to bad-acting by members. Just too many truncated posts.

Obviously I want to use HTML. I have rarely posted to this list in the past four years or so - it's too much trouble with the email program I was using (Eudora) to remember to turn HTML off when I want to post, and then turn it back on afterwards. Prior to that time I was a regular contributor to this list, and paid my dues whenever Jack asked for money.

There is another solution, should this rule continue to be written in titanium: use an email program that allows you to specify which domains to send text only to, while sending HTML only, or text/HTML to all others. There may be other programs, but I've switched to Mozilla's Thunderbird (free). I didn't switch because of this feature, but it is valuable for lists that have the no HTML rule. If you can read this post, I guess it must be working!

73, Jan - VE7DJX

>

Mime-Version: 1.0
Message-Id: <p05210600c067136cade7@[192.168.1.100]>
Date: Sat, 15 Apr 2006 18:07:10 -0400
To: Old Tube Radios <boatanchors@theporch.com>
From: Richard Post <postr@ohiou.edu>
Subject: And another dirty old Viking
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="us-ascii" ; format="flowed"

This must be open season on dirty Vikings. One jumped on my bench a few days ago. Has the 4D32. Filthy dirty but the aluminum chassis has cleaned up very nicely. Have replaced both the 6 and the 117 volt pilot light assemblies because of the danger of shorts (loose, possibly-shrunk fiber insulators, weak center rivets). Since these were kits using screws, you can easily strip the chassis down to whatever level is needed. I removed the aluminum shield pieces to clean the chassis. The BAMA material is very complete on these. I

printed out a small notebook on operation and construction.

The rack-mount cabinet is definitely made of steel. I'll need to steel-brush the rust off the bottom piece. If you can't find one, it looks as if any generic deep rack case with an 8 and 3/4 inch high opening should work OK. The paint on mine is original small wrinkle but if its maroon, it's definitely the darkest, blackest maroon I've seen.

Question: What would cause an old Viking to get shot in the face? (Or whatever was used to put a sloppy 3/4 inch hole on the front panel about an inch and a half below the viking logo picture?) The perpetrator even bent a bit of the aluminum shield behind the panel to accommodate whatever control was placed or planned for that location.

I thought about repairing the hole with bondo but that would mean repainting the panel which is not in that bad a shape. Maybe I'll just stick a hole plug in it for now.

Stay tuned for progress reports.

73,
Rich

<http://www.qsl.net/kb8tad>

At 2:07 PM -0700 4/14/06, johnmb wrote:

>
> Mine was in the standard cabinet (which I believe is aluminum?!)
> good ... they clean up very nicely (aluminum chassis and typically
> nice EFJ
> hardware and sockets.

> Al Parker <anchor@ec.rr.com> wrote.
> >Hi folks,
>> A dirty Johnson Viking 1 came home with me yesterday. I guess my
> >basic question is, "is it worthy of refurbishment?"

End of BOATANCHORS Digest 3912
